UC-NRLF

8 3 020 208

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Received *Jan.* , 1808

Accession No. *69040* . Class No.

7-1893
PAPERS ON SCHOOL ISSUES OF THE DAY. V.

PEDAGOGICAL CHAIRS

—IN—

Colleges and Universities.

—BY—

B. A. HINSDALE, PH. D.,

Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching in the University of Michigan.

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE NORMAL DEPARTMENT, NATIONAL
EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION, JULY, 1889.

SYRACUSE, N. Y.:

C. W. BARDEEN, PUBLISHER,
1889.

Helps in Language Teaching.

1. *Normal Language Lessons*: being the instruction in Grammar given at the Cortland State Normal School. By Prof. S. J. SORNERGER. 16mo, boards, pp. 81. 50 cts.

Whatever text-book the teacher uses, or if he uses no text-book at all, he will find this manual of great assistance. Its classification is simple, its definitions are careful, its tabular analyses are complete, and its reference by page to all the best authors makes it invaluable.

2. *Exercises in English Syntax*. By A. G. BUGREE. 16mo, leatherette, pp. 87. 35 cts.

This differs from other handbooks of sentences for class-drill in that it does not print wrong sentences to be corrected,—a practice now generally condemned, because incorrect forms should never be put before the child's eye,—but leaves blanks in the sentence to be filled by the pupil from a choice of expressions given, thus calling in the most effective way to right usage and its reasons. It is of especial assistance in preparation for Regents' examinations, which always include much work of this kind. Send for special circular with specimen sentences, and recommendations.

3. *The Regents' Questions in Grammar*, from the beginning to June, 1882. By DANIEL J. PRATT, Assistant Secretary. 16mo, manilla, pp. 109. 25 cts.

This unequalled series of questions is recognized throughout the country as the best drill-book ever made, and the only satisfactory preparation for examination.

An edition of these Questions, with complete answers, and references to the grammars of Brown, May, Green, Clark, Keil, Quackenbos, Weld & Quackenbos, Hart, Fowler, Swinton, Reed & Kellogg, and Whitney, will be sent post-paid to any address on receipt of One Dollar. It contains 198 pages, and is handsomely bound in cloth.

4. *Dime Question Book No. 14, Grammar*. By ALBERT P. SOUTHWICK. 16mo, paper, pp. 35. 10 cts.

This is one of the best books in a deservedly popular series, giving full answers to every question, with notes, queries, etc. Conductor John Kennedy says: "The bad question book fosters cram; the good one suggests study. Mr. Southwick's system is good. It is happy and nourishing. I hope you may sell a million of them."

5. *The Diacritical Speller*. A practical course of exercises in Spelling and Pronunciation. By C. R. BALES. 8vo, boards, pp. 68. 50 cts.

This work is novel even in a field so thoroughly worked as spelling. Its striking features are conciseness and simplicity. The pupil is not drilled upon what all pupils know, but only upon what most pupils fail in. The collections of words are made with great skill, and the pupil who uses this book is not likely to say Toosday or Reuler. The selection of test-words is particularly happy, and the exercises in synonyms will afford material for many a spare ten minutes.—*California Teacher*.

6. *An Aid to English Grammar*; designed principally for Teachers. By ASHER P. STARKWEATHER. 16mo, boards, pp. 230. 75 cts.

This is a grammar aid book on a wholly original plan. It is simply a collection of words which are used as two or more parts of speech, with illustrative sentences to show their correct use.—*School Herald, Chicago*.

C. W. BARDEEN, Publisher, Syracuse, N. Y.

PEDAGOGICAL CHAIRS IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

B. A. HINSDALE, PH. D.,

Professor of the Science and Art of Teaching, Michigan University, Ann Arbor.

(A paper read before the Normal Department, National Educational Association, Nashville, Tenn., July, 1889.)

Pedagogical chairs have long existed in the principal universities of Germany. Since 1876 the "Bell Chairs of the Theory, History and Art of Education" have existed in the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, Scotland; and still more recently similar chairs have been established in several of the universities of the United States. The object of this paper is to justify the existence of these chairs: not pedagogical instruction, nor pedagogical chairs in general, but such instruction and such chairs in colleges and universities.

At the outset, attention may be drawn to three historical facts: Germany leads the world in scholarship and scientific research, and particularly in the cultivation of educational science; Scotland, also, is a classic land of learning and of schools; moreover, our American chairs of pedagogy are a result of the widest and profoundest interest in educational subjects known to our history. These facts are very significant, creating a strong presumption that these German, Scottish and American professorships are not the results of ignorance or accident, but of intelligent choice and a felt need. From the high vantage-ground of this presumption, the broader aspects of the subject will be surveyed.

The word "education" is one of the most plastic and flexible in the language. It is used dynamically and statically, in a collective and in an individual sense. Excluding all life but human life, also the collective and the static senses, we find the word employed in three different acceptations.

1. The process of transformation wrought in a man by all the agents and powers that act on him, of whatever kind, from the cradle to the grave; as well those that constitute his natural and social improvement, as those that constitute the home and the school; as well those that are blind, unconscious, and unpremeditated, as those that are intelligent, conscious, and premeditated.

2. The process of transformation wrought in a man by the premeditated action of society, with a view of developing his powers and moulding his character; such efforts being put forth more especially in his infancy and youth.

3. The process of transformation wrought in a man, mostly in his youth

and plastic years, by governors and tutors, and particularly in schools of some sort.

The first of these definitions includes both the others; the second includes the third. Just how much of the whole field the science of education covers, and whether this science and pedagogy are coëxtensive, are questions not definitely settled. "A complete history of education," says Compayré, "would embrace, in its vast developments, the entire record of the intellectual and moral culture of mankind at all periods and in all countries. It would be a *résumé* of the life of humanity in its diverse manifestations, literary and scientific, religious and political. It would determine the causes, so numerous and so diverse, which act upon the characters of men, and which, modifying a common endowment, produce beings which are as different as are a contemporary of Pericles and a modern European, a Frenchman of the Middle Ages, and a Frenchman subsequent to the revolution." The extreme limits of this field are determined by such inquiries as those that have engaged the attention of Mr. E. B. Taylor and Sir John Lubbock, on the one hand, and such speculations and visions as those of Plato, Gerson, and Swedenborg, on the other. A history of education in this sense would be, as Compayré says, "a sort of philosophy of history, to which nothing would be foreign, and which would scrutinize in its most varied and most trifling causes, as well as in its most profound sources, the moral life of humanity." The university cultivates this vast field, although not under the name of a single science. The chairs of anthropology, history, archæology and antiquities, philosophy, literature, philology, ethics, comparative religion, jurisprudence, and politics, mark its most important subdivisions. No one denies the university's right to investigate or teach every one of these or related subjects. But when, with Compayré, we throw out the "*occult coadjutors* of education—climate, race, manners, social conditions, political institutions, religious beliefs," and narrow the field to the "premeditated action which the will of one man exercises over other men in order to instruct them and train them;"* or when, with Bain, we throw out still other factors, and confine the science of education to the "arts and methods employed by the school-master," as typifying the educational process in its greatest singleness and purity†—when this is done, is the remaining territory the proper subject of university investigation and instruction? So long as the university investigates and teaches the ideas, habits, customs, governments, and religions of the lowest savages—that is, the whole compass of their culture—it will be difficult to deny its rights to treat with equal respect the educational ideas, theories, methods, appliances, and systems of the most highly civilized nations.

By common consent the university has two great functions. One of these is research, the discovery of truth; the other is instruction, the practice of

* Compayré: *History of Pedagogy*. Introduction. Boston, 1886.

† Bain: *Education and Science*, 6. New York, 1879.

the art of teaching—that is, the university first finds out truth, and then gives it forth. The two interact. Furthermore, the university not only practices research, but it makes research itself the object of study and investigation. Science becomes reflective, and lays bare all her processes and methods. Why, then, should it not investigate and teach its other function, viz., that of teaching? Why should an institution that exists for the sake of investigating the arts and sciences, leave its own peculiar art neglected and despised?

But education is much more than a great and difficult art: it is a noble science. Back of its methods, processes, and systems, are facts, ideas, principles, and theories—in fact, whole systems of philosophy. As Rosenkranz remarks, pedagogy cannot be deduced from a single principle with such strictness as logic and ethics, but is a mixed science, like medicine, deriving its presuppositions from other sciences,* as physiology, psychology, logic, æsthetics, ethics, and sociology. It is therefore conditioned upon some of the noblest of the sciences, especially those of the moral group. The very fact that it is a mixed science adds to its difficulty, and emphasizes the demand for its cultivation. It is hard to see how the university, whose admitted function is education, can pass by the science of education without discrediting its own work and virtually denying its own name. To practice the art and refuse to cultivate or teach the science of teaching, is little better than rank empiricism.

The last argument derives additional strength from the peculiar stage of education upon which the foremost nations and countries have now entered. Education has at last reached the reflective or scientific stage. Throwing off the clutch of the empiricist, she has ascended to her long-vacant seat in the family of sciences. Evidences of this are the increased attention paid to education by text-writers on psychology and ethics, the later pedagogical literature, and the more systematic and rational methods of instruction in schools, and the rapidly-increasing facilities for teaching educational science. Thus the very existence of the chair is a proof of its usefulness and its necessity. On this ground alone—indeed, on the narrower ground of endowing research alone—the chair can be fully vindicated.

Again, education has a history. In the very broadest sense, the field of educational history is the field of human culture; and even when limited, as before, to the conscious work of teachers in schools, it still presents whole series of facts, problems and lessons of the greatest interest and importance. Before the pedagogist lies the whole field of school-life, from the simple prophets' and priests' schools of early times to the highly-developed schools and school systems of Europe and America. While education belongs to general history, the study of which is pursued for its culture value, it has been almost wholly neglected. The writer and lecturer on general history do indeed touch the education of the ancients, and make mention of the

* *The Philosophy of Education*, 1. New York, 1886.

mediæval universities; they pay some small attention to the marvelous educational developments of modern times; but they lay much more emphasis on subjects of far inferior interest. But education should be made the subject of special historical study as much as religion, art, or politics. Were it as thoroughly investigated as the Polytechnic School of München investigates engineering (maintaining forty-five distinct courses of lectures in that science), the history of education alone would tax the resources of the most learned and laborious professor. It is not contended that the chair of pedagogy can at present cultivate this field as carefully as this allusion may imply; but certainly here are topics of the greatest interest and importance, that demand admission to the university list on an equal footing with other subjects of historical investigation. So long as the history of education is a means of education, so long will it continue a proper university study.

Thus far the argument has been theoretical, resting on the need of investigating the science, art and history of teaching, and on their educational value. But the practical phases of the subject must also be presented.

1. Even if the work done by the pedagogical chair should pay no immediate attention to the preparation of teachers, it could not fail to be of much practical value. The scientific study and teaching of a science and an art in their purely theoretical aspects always promote the practice of the art; and the presence in every university in the land of a pedagogical professor, thoroughly devoted to his chair, could not fail to quicken interest in the subject, and to promote the teaching art.

2. While it is a serious error to hold the university merely as a place of instruction and to overlook research—an error that is only too common in the United States—instruction is still one of its grand functions. It is engaged in teaching the highest branches of knowledge. Its professors hold their chairs by reason of their professional ability, as well as by reason of their learning. Where, then, may the science, the history, and the art of teaching be so properly taught as where the art flourishes in its highest forms?

3. The conditions of pedagogical study existing in the university are the best that can be imagined. First, the university offers the student a varied curriculum from which to choose collateral studies. Secondly, it illustrates teaching in all the branches of liberal, and in many branches of technical study. Thirdly, the library, which furnishes an extensive apparatus for general as well as special study, is an invaluable facility. Fourthly, the university is the home of liberal studies; its traditions and associations are conducive to cultivation, and the student in residence finds himself in the midst of a learned and cultivated society.

The last of these points is deserving of a more elaborate statement. It is well known that special schools tend at once to depth and narrowness: intension is secured at the expense of extension. This is necessary to a degree; but if the process is carried too far, mischievous results follow. Hence the

advantage of uniting the professional school with the school of liberal studies; an advantage greater now than ever before, because scholars, men of science and teachers are pushing specialization to its extreme limits. We should not be surprised, therefore, to find all the writers who have touched the topic laying much stress on the advantage to the student of receiving his pedagogical instruction in unacademical institutions. Professor Laurie insists that the teachers of the secondary schools of Scotland need professional preparation as well as university training. "Where shall they get this?" he asks. "They might be required to combine attendance at a training college with attendance at the university for a degree; but this, though it might serve as a provisional arrangement, would not secure the end we seek. And why should not this arrangement secure the end we seek? For this reason, and for no other, that a specialist training college does not answer the same purpose as a university. The broader culture, the purer air, the higher aims of the latter give to it an educational influence which specialist colleges can never exercise."*

Whether academical teaching should be furnished in a normal school, is a question often discussed. That question does not come within the range of this paper; but the observation may be made that such instruction must be defended theoretically, if at all, on the ground of its liberalizing and strengthening tendencies.

4. It is a function of the university to furnish society with teachers. Research, teaching, and the preparation of teachers, are the three great duties that it owes society. The preparation of teachers for primary and grammar schools, and possibly for the lower classes of high schools, may be left to normal and training schools. But high schools and other secondary schools must receive their character from teachers of a higher grade of scholarship. It is the favorite conceit of some public-school men that the public schools are fully adequate to create their own teachers, unless it be in some of the more special lines of high-school study and instruction; even the superintendents, they hold, should "come up from the ranks;" but no man who understands the tendencies and effects of specialization, particularly the results of breeding in-and-in, will for a moment favor such a narrow policy. The public schools have done an invaluable work in furnishing teachers to society; but it is a weighty fact that no schools more need to be kept in vital relation with the schools of higher instruction.

5. The chair of pedagogy and the teaching profession need the strength and dignity that university recognition will give them. Such recognition will be the strongest testimony that the university can bear to the public of the estimate in which it holds the art that it exists to practice. In that way, too, it will most strongly impress its students with the estimate in which it holds the teacher's calling. When our aspiring young men and women see accomplished professors of the science, history and art of teaching in

*The Training of Teachers, 10, 11. London, 1882.

the colleges and universities of the land, vying with the professors of philosophy, ethics, jurisprudence, political economy, and history, in the exposition of their favorite subjects, they will form a higher conception of the teacher's work. This argument also has been urged with much force by writers on education. Professor Laurie, for example, says that the teaching profession of Scotland, almost with one voice, hailed the action of the trustees of the Bell fund, who established the Bell chairs at St. Andrews and Edinburgh. The feeling was, they "have conferred honor on a department of work that Dr. Bell delighted to honor. They have unquestionably done very much to promote education in Scotland, not only by raising the work of the school-master in public estimation, but also by attracting public attention to education as being not merely a question of machinery for the institution of schools (essential though this undoubtedly is), but a question of principles and methods—in brief, of philosophy." He says, further, that the institution of the Edinburgh chair increased the importance of the teaching body, gave it academical standing, and made it possible for the first time to institute in the universities a faculty of education, like the faculties of law, medicine, and theology.*

The argument can be strengthened by historical analogies. Professional instruction has long been given in the highest seminaries of learning. The learned professions have loved to nestle under the wings of the universities. The faculties of theology, law, and medicine, have so long been constituent parts of the university that some may suppose that such has always been the case. But this is not the fact: the faculty of arts is the original faculty on which the university was founded, and around which the other faculties have grown up. One of our ablest American pedagogists—my honored predecessor at the University of Michigan, President W. H. Payne—says: "The main strength of the recognized professions is their organic connection with great seats of learning. Law, medicine, and theology," he goes so far as to say, "had never been professions except on the condition of university recognition and support; nor could their professional character be sustained if this support were withdrawn."†

The argument from recognition derives additional strength from the history of education. No other noble art have men treated with such general contempt. No other noble calling, at least in its lower walks, has been abandoned to such unworthy agents. According to Socrates, the Athenians took more care in selecting trainers for their horses than for their children; and Plutarch says that in his day, as men assigned their slaves to different employments according to their fitness, if they found any slave who was a drunkard or a glutton, or unfit for any other business, they made him a pedagogue. Luther says he was whipped fifteen times on one day at school, because he could not recite what he had not been taught. Compayré says,

*The Training of Teachers, 6, 7, 17.

†Contributions to the Science of Education, 269. New York, 1886.

as late as 1837 the French school-masters practiced all the trades; they were day laborers, shoemakers, ushers, beadles, and inn-keepers; they were poorly paid, and enjoyed no social consideration; they were on the same footing as mendicants, and were often infirm, crippled, and unfit for any kind of work. Carleton has told the tale of the hedge school-masters of Ireland. Whether men have despised the training of children, and so committed it to such unworthy agents, or whether they have allowed it to fall into such hands and then despised it, is immaterial; but certainly from classic days to recent times the elementary school and its teachers have been made the subjects of keenest ridicule. What a figure the school-master cuts in literature, from the days of "the flogging Orbilius" to the days of Dominie Sampson and Squeers! Commonly cruel and tyrannical, generally ignorant, always uncouth and awkward, and if occasionally learned, also pedantic, the school-master of literature is not a character in whom to feel a professional pride. No doubt the satirists have made the most of their opportunities; no doubt there have been many admirable teachers; but on the whole, in no other vocation has the workman fallen so far below his work as in teaching. We live in better times. At present, society is demanding that teachers shall have higher literary qualifications, and that they shall be superior persons; both of them most hopeful signs. The university will materially strengthen these tendencies by maintaining the chair of education.

6. There is still a broader ground upon which the question can be urged. Teachers are not the only persons who are interested in educational problems. Those problems concern and should interest all intelligent men and women. If the graduates from our higher institutions of learning could take two courses of lectures, one in theory and practice and one in the history of education, before receiving their diplomas, they would find the knowledge and training thus received of very great advantage to them. Mr. Spencer's vigorous argument on this point will not soon be forgotten. "*The subject which involves all other subjects, and therefore the subject in which the education of every one should terminate, is the theory and practice of teaching.*"

7. The university itself needs the chair of education to give it completeness and symmetry. So long as its right, its duty even, to investigate and teach the arts and sciences generally is not only admitted but asserted, it is strange, indeed, that anyone should question its right and duty to investigate and teach its own processes and the principles underlying them. The fact is, in this respect the university is an empiricist. Heretofore it might say in self-defense that education was largely empirical; but that argument has now lost all force. Nor can a university in any other way so effectually defend education against that charge as by creating a professorship to cultivate it as a science.

But this is not all: the university needs the chair for practical reasons, separate and apart from the preparation of teachers. Its occupant, if a man of real force and attainments, could not fail to stimulate pedagogical

thought among both professors and students, thus creating a mental habit and an atmosphere that would be useful in many ways. Somebody should stand in the faculty for educational science. Particular stress may be laid on the new college and university conditions growing out of elective studies, such as forcing upon students the difficult and important subject of educational values. Then the study of education may be strongly recommended to advanced students on disciplinary and culture grounds. When they near the end of the curriculum they cannot, indeed, correct the mistakes that they have made; but they can coördinate their knowledge and their ideas, giving to the sum-total of their attainments something of the form and consistency of system. And this is in the highest degree desirable. It solidifies, and so preserves, what has been learned, and influences further acquirement. It is my firm conviction that college and university seniors generally could spend a semester in such an intellectual clearing-house with the greatest advantage. Nor is there any place where this work can be so well done as in the class-room of a competent professor of pedagogy. On this ground alone, a chair of pedagogy in the higher institutions can be successfully advocated.

The history of the universities throws much light on our subject; and I shall close by stating some of the more important facts of that history, drawing them from Sir William Hamilton's articles on "English Universities" and "University Reform," published in the *Edinburgh Review** a half-century ago, and from other sources.

In the older universities of the Parisian model, instruction was not confided to a special body of professors; the university was taught and governed by the graduates-at-large. Professor, Master and Doctor were synonymous terms. Every graduate had the equal right to teach publicly in the university the subjects belonging to his faculty and to the rank of his degree, and was even required by the terms of his degree to do so. The bachelor was bound to read, under a master or doctor in his faculty, a course of lectures; and the master or doctor was obliged immediately to commence (*incepere*) and to continue for a certain period to teach (*regere*) some of the subjects belonging to his faculty. Hence "commencement," the time when the perfect graduate commenced to teach; hence the so-called "necessary regency." However, the universities did not enforce the obligation of public teaching so long as there were a competent number of voluntary teachers, or *regents*, to do the work; besides, the schools belonging to the several faculties were frequently inadequate to accommodate the young inceptors. And so it came to pass that the period of necessary regency was successively shortened, and finally dispensations from actual teaching were commonly allowed. In these circumstances originated the distinction of *regent* and *non-regent*; to the first of whom, progressively, full privileges of legislation

* Found in "Discussions of Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform." Edinburgh and London, 1866.

and government came to be confined. This distinction was most rigidly marked in the faculty of the arts. "In the other faculties," says Sir William Hamilton, "both Paris and Oxford, all doctors succeeded in usurping the style and privileges of *regent*, though not actually engaged in teaching; and in Oxford the same was allowed to masters of the faculty of arts during the statutory period of their necessary regency, even when availing themselves of a dispensation from the performance of its duties, and extended to the heads of houses and to college deans."

Hamilton says the teaching function was accorded the bachelor on two grounds: "Partly as an exercise towards the higher honor, and useful to himself; partly as a performance due for the degree obtained, and of advantage to others." But while recognizing the responsibility of the imperfect graduate to the university, and to the public, he lays the larger stress on the other branch of the argument. He says: "The compulsory lecturing—the *necessary regency* of graduates or *inceptors* in the ancient universities, mainly proceeded on the profound principle, *Doce ut discas*. As the scholastic proverb runs:

"Discere si queris, doceas, sic ipse doceris;
Nam studio tali proficis atque sodali."

The advantage that the learner derives from teaching was a favorite topic with this great scholar, thinker, and teacher, and he returns to it again and again. Among others he quotes Bishop Sanderson, who in turn quotes one of the Rabbis: "I have learned much from my masters, more from my equals, but most of all from my disciples."

Sir William Hamilton shows that the course of academical history was very different in England and in Germany. In the English universities, the graduate remained in the legislative and ruling body, although practically denied his right to teach in the school; in the German universities, he retained his privilege of teaching but lost that of governing. In Germany "it is only requisite that he should farther write, and formally defend what is called a *Dissertatio ad locum*, to enable him to lecture in the university, on any subject within the compass of his faculty, and to have his course or courses announced in the public *Series Praelectionum*. The opportunity thus afforded to all graduates of publicly manifesting their learning, and their ability as teachers, is with the admirable *system of academical patronage*, a main cause of the uniform excellence of the German Protestant universities, as organs of information." The thesis that the candidate for the Doctor's degree is now required to "defend" as well as to read, is a survival of the ancient custom.

It is not difficult to discover the causes that made bachelors as well as masters university teachers, and that afterwards ousted them from their privileges. The multitude of pupils that flocked to the mediæval universities, 10,000 to Bologna, and 30,000 to Oxford, many of whom were very young and immature, called for a large number of teachers. The university

felt its obligations to the public. Moreover, the conviction that teaching is a most important means of learning had great influence. The establishment of secondary schools, which drew away the younger pupils from the universities; the growth of science in both breadth and depth; the development of specialization in teaching and in research; and the ambition of the "Dons"—these are the main causes that banished from the universities the somewhat miscellaneous body of teachers of the earlier times, and established a body of professional instructors. The change was not only natural but inevitable.

The causes that banished the graduate, perfect as well as imperfect, from the university as a teacher, will prevent his reappearance in that capacity. The university cannot again furnish society with teachers, or teachers with needed discipline, in the ancient manner. The forces that worked the great change are far stronger to prevent its being unworked. This is a revolution that will not go backward. What then? Shall the university forget its ancient function of furnishing society with teachers? Shall it pretend that when it has made scholars it has also made teachers, and thus ignore or deny the value of professional training? Shall it confine itself to research and to teaching? Or shall it remember its ancient practice, and, recognizing all the new conditions, including the demand for the professional training of teachers, establish and maintain the Chair of Education until the time comes for the chair to give way to the Faculty of Education? This last is a question to which there can be but one answer.

It will be seen that while the college and university are mentioned together in the caption of this paper, the university alone has been mentioned in the argument. Hence the observation that, as the college raises its standard and approaches the level of university work, the same reasons will apply to it as to the university.

DISCUSSION.*

S. S. PARR, of Minnesota: While chairs of didactics do a good work and accomplish much for education, the distinction must be clearly drawn between the kind of work they can do, and that done by professional schools. Chairs of didactics do work of a general nature; professional schools do work of a distinctly specific nature.

JEROME ALLEN, of New York: The distinction should be made between college and university work, and normal-school work. Shall we have pedagogical work of high order in universities, or shall the instruction of pedagogy be confined to normal schools? The question is often asked, "Who are our professional educators?" Persons who teach, often pursue other vo-

* From the Secretary's report.

cations, so that it is difficult to know who are genuine professional teachers. Only when our colleges and universities shall have regular chairs, or better, faculties of pedagogics, can we point out distinctly our professional teachers.

JOSEPH BALDWIN, of Texas: I regard the paper as complete, and in need of no comment other than praise, and the commendation of the section. Demands are now being made upon our institutions of learning which they must meet. It is reasonably expected now, that the higher seminaries shall send out graduates competent to teach. But how can they teach without special preparation? Would a young graduate venture upon the prerogatives of an attorney without careful study of law and jurisprudence? Would he venture to restore the sick to health without the careful preparation given in a medical school? Shall we, then, send out teachers without special preparation? We do what we can, to be sure, in our normal schools; but many of our teachers never enter normal schools; hence the necessity for pedagogical instruction in all our colleges and universities. We should therefore press this matter, and encourage even every boarding-school to establish and maintain chairs of pedagogy.

JAMES H. HOOSE, of New York: Concerning chairs of pedagogy, I say, the more the better, as a rule. But I ask, What will be the benefit of lectures delivered to students in ordinary boarding-schools and colleges while they are pursuing academic studies? The pursuit of the regular curriculum will absorb all their energies and time; and they will care but little for the theory and methods of teaching before they realize the necessity of preparing to enter the school-room as teachers. What we need, then, are schools of practice; not lectures on the history of education.

MR. ALLEN: Why not study the history of education, as well as the history of the church or of civil government?

MR. HOOSE: I admit that; but I hold that the average school-boy or girl is not interested in the philosophy of such history, or in a discussion of the theory and methods of imparting information. What they want is practice—feeling of the pulse, as it were, of real, living pupils—and not empty theorizing. Hence, I say, let all our colleges and universities first establish practice departments in which to set up pedagogical chairs.

B. A. HINSDALE, of Michigan: In practice, nearly all colleges which have pedagogical chairs, have, as pupils for such instruction, young men and women who have had more or less experience as teachers.

W. B. POWELL, of Washington, D.C.: This is an important subject of discussion. I doubt if the history of education is of any importance compared with the science of education. My experience shows that time given to boys and girls in teaching the history of education is almost lost. The science of teaching is the proper field of normal instruction, or the investigation of sciences after they have been academically mastered.

8000780174

RETURN
TO →CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
202 Main Library

LOAN PERIOD 1

HOME USE

4

2

3

5

6

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

Renewals and Recharges may be made 4 days prior to the due date.

Books may be Renewed by calling 642-3405

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

AUTO DISC CIRC JUN 25 '93

FEB 09 1996

FORM NO. DD6

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY
BERKELEY, CA 94720

YC 57352

LIBRARY USE

A

LB2805

F3

v. 2